



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/730,647

12/08/2003

Tsz Simon Cheng

BOC9-2003-0054 (425)

2979

40987 7590 09/18/2008
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
P. O. BOX 3188
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER

MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/730,647	Applicant(s) CHENG ET AL.	
	Examiner SAJEDA MUHEBBULLAH	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 8-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 8-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed on 07/09/2008.
2. Claims 1-4 and 8-11 are pending in this application. Claims 5-7 and 12-28 have been cancelled and claim 1 has been amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janes et al. ("Janes", US 6,642,346), Carnahan et al. ("Carnahan", US 7,212,996), Beaudet et al. ("Beaudet", US 5,491,795) and Balasubramanian et al. ("Balasubramanian", US 2003/0046289).

As per claim 1, Janes teaches an electronic commerce method comprising the steps of:

determining at least one e-commerce partner (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2*);

determining whether said e-commerce partner is an active partner based on at least one predetermined criteria, wherein determining whether said e-commerce partner is an active partner comprises at least one of the following steps, each step being based on a corresponding criterion:

detecting whether a transaction has occurred with said e-commerce partner within a designated time period (col.8, lines 19-21, *orders must have occurred within a designated time period to have been made wherein the time period could be indefinite*);

determining whether transactions involving said e-commerce partner exceed a designated valuation threshold;

determining whether a transaction involving said e-commerce partner exceeds a designated data size; and

determining whether said e-commerce partner has a preference level above a designated preference level (col.8, lines 19-21, *partners with orders may have a higher preference level than those without orders*);

presenting a partner identifier as an expandable partner node within a commerce graphical user interface for said e-commerce partner if it is determined that said e-commerce partner is an active partner (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2*);

when the partner node is expanded, presenting at least one transaction identifier as a child node of said expanded partner node, wherein each transaction identifier represents an e-commerce transaction between a user of the commerce graphical user interface and said e-commerce partner (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2 expanded presents transaction 901*).

categorizing a node associated with at least one of a transaction and an e-commerce partner;

visually differentiating said node from other nodes based upon a category of said node (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2 icon different from 901 icon*; col.9, lines 43-45).

However, Janes does not teach wherein the criteria for determining an active partner is adjustable, differentiating nodes at the same node level and at different node level and assigning responsible personnel to transactions based on predetermined rules. Carnahan teaches a method of displaying commerce products based on adjustable criteria (Carnahan, col.4, lines 44-46;

Art Unit: 2174

col.5, lines 42-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Carnahan's teaching with Janes' method in order to filter out relevant information.

Furthermore, the method of Janes and Carnahan does not teach differentiating nodes at the same node level and at different node level and assigning responsible personnel to transactions based on predetermined rules. Beaudet teaches a method of displaying differentiating nodes at the same and different levels (Beaudet, Fig.4, col.4, lines 37-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Beaudet's teaching with the method of Janes and Carnahan in order to visualize the different transactions.

Furthermore, the method of Janes, Carnahan and Beaudet does not teach assigning responsible personnel to transactions based on predetermined rules. Balasubramanian teaches a method of processing transactions wherein based on the transaction type, the transaction is assigned to the appropriate agent (Balasubramanian, para.0050). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Balasubramanian's teaching with the method of Janes, Carnahan and Beaudet in order to streamline issues to the appropriate expertise to handle the issue faster and more effectively.

As per claim 2, Janes teaches the method wherein said electronic commerce transactions include at least one business-to-business transaction, and wherein said e-commerce partners include at least one trading partner (Fig.2G, *trading partner Vendor 2*).

As per claim 3, Janes teaches the method further comprising the step of: providing a business partner gateway, wherein said commerce graphical user interface is an interface for interacting with said business partner gateway (col.3, lines 37-40).

As per claim 4, Janes teaches the method wherein said electronic commerce transactions include at least one business-to-consumer transaction, and wherein said e-commerce partners include at least one consumer (col.3, lines 61-67).

As per claim 8, Janes teaches the method further comprising the step of: detecting a transmission error; and indicating within said graphical user interface that an error occurred during an associated transmission (Fig.9, col.11, lines 47-55).

5. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janes et al. ("Janes", US 6,642,346), Carnahan et al. ("Carnahan", US 7,212,996), Beaudet et al. ("Beaudet", US 5,491,795) and Balasubramanian et al. ("Balasubramanian", US 2003/0046289) in view of Xu (US 2004/0119743).

As per claim 9, the method of Janes, Carnahan, Beaudet, and Balasubramanian teaches the method comprising the step of receiving a selection specifying a node of said graphical user interface (Janes, col.9, lines 29-30). However, the method of Janes, Carnahan, Beaudet, and Balasubramanian does not teach the step of responsively establishing a communication session between a user of said commerce graphical user interface and the e-commerce partner associated with said node. Xu teaches a method of displaying transactions in a commerce environment wherein a communication session may be established between a user and partner (Xu, para.0078, para.0093). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to include Xu's teaching with the method of Janes, Carnahan, Beaudet, and Balasubramanian in order to interact with partners in real-time.

As per claim 10, Xu teaches the method of claim 9, wherein said communication session is an instant messaging session (para.0094).

As per claim 11, Xu teaches the method of claim 9, wherein said establishing step further comprises the steps of: selecting a communication channel and establishing said communication session through said communication channel (para.0094).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 07/09/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued the following:

a) Janes displays all customers with orders regardless when the orders were placed, whereas in the present invention only partners who have had transactions within certain time period (such as 72 hours) are displayed.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per a), Janes teaches the display of active partners to be those customers with orders (col.8, lines 19-21). Orders must have occurred within a designated time period which could be indefinite for that order to have been made.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Communications

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4065**. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday/Thursday and alt. Mondays from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124.

The central fax number for the organization where correspondence for this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sajeda Muhebbullah

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2174

/S. M./

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178